REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Interference Requirements

The Office observed that the Application failed to meet all of the requirements needed to trigger an interference. The missing requirements are all satisfied by filings herein. In particular:

A) The Applicant provides the following statement satisfying 37 CFR 1.608(b).

The Applicant is entitled to an earlier date of invention as evidenced by the attached declaration of Darrell G. Meyer, showing a date of invention on or about March 27, 1996 for the Weight Bearing System of the current application. This earlier date of invention, pre-dates the earliest constructive reduction to practice of Buecker (US Pat. No. 6131362), which is February 2, 1998. Further, the earlier date of invention of March 27, 1996 for Meyer, is corroborated by the attached declaration of Sanjay Mishra, disclosing the subject matter of the current application.

- B) The Applicant complied with 37 CFR 41.202(a)(3), (5), (6) and MPEP § 2304.02(c) as follows:
 - a) Applicant provides herein a claim chart satisfying 37 CFR 41.202(a)(3) and MPEP § 2304.02(c), comparing at least one claim of each party corresponding to the count. See attached claim comparison chart, columns 1 and 2.
 - b) Applicant provides herein a detailed explanation satisfying 37 CFR 41.202(a)(4), (a)(6), (d) and MPEP § 2304.02(c),as to why Applicant will prevail on priority. See attached claim comparison chart, column 3.
 - e) Applicant provides herein a claim chart satisfying 37 CFR 41.202(a)(5) and MPEP § 2304.02(d), showing the written description for each claim in the Applicant's specification. See attached claim comparison chart, column 4.

Priority

The Office acknowledged the Applicant's claim for the benefit of prior-filed application, but objected to the priority data of the earlier application because it was not consistent with the USPTO record. The objection to the priority data of the earlier application has been overcome by amending the specification as shown above.

35 USC 112

The Office objected to claim 32, 48, 54, and 56 as failing to satisfy the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Office's objection to claim 32 was that the <u>recited thicknesses</u> of the metal sheeting was not supported by the specification. The Applicant agrees, and has amended claim 32 to recite 18-20 gauge, as opposed to 16-24 gauge.

The Office's objection to claim 48 was that the specification fails to show <u>a pair</u> of web walls extending from the angular supports. The Applicant disagrees. The term "pair" means "two of a kind, as in: I need a new pair of shoes." (See <u>www.business-</u>

words.com/dictionary/P_1.html). Here the two web walls 240 do form a "pair" (see figure 2) since they are two of a kind. Nevertheless, the Applicant sees no benefit in arguing the point at this stage in the prosecution, and has therefore amended claim 48 to recite a first web wall and a second web wall extending from the upper and lower chords, and a main web wall extending between the lower and upper chords.

The Office's objection to claim 54 was that the specification provides no support for the main substantially flat web wall extending <u>straight</u> between another of the side wall on each of the chords. The Applicant agrees, and has amended claim 54 to recite two angular support walls, each of which extend from one of the side walls and a substantially flat main web wall extending straight between one of the angular support walls on each chord.

Finally, the Office's objection to claim 56 was that the specification provides no support for the web walls of one of the beam components <u>overlapping</u> the web walls of the other of the beam components. The Applicant agrees, and has amended claim 56 to recite a first and a

second sheet metal web wall, and a substantially flat main web wall that are disposed of between the beam components.

35 USC 102

The Office rejected all pending claims (claims 29-56) as being anticipated by Buecker (US 6131362). That rejection is overcome by evidence provided herein that Darrel Meyer is the first inventor of the claimed subject matter.

Request For Allowance

 ${\it Claims}~29\text{-}56~are~pending~in~this~application.~The~Applicant~requests~allowance~of~all~pending~claims.$

Respectfully submitted,

Fish & Associates, PC

Robert D. Fish Reg. No. 33880

Fish & Associates, PC 2603 Main Street, Suite 1050 Irvine, CA 92614-6232 Telephone (949) 253-0944 Fax (949) 253-9069